



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,314	10/23/2003	David A. Kranz	2682.2032-000	8597
22852 7590 03/21/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER PARDO, THUY N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/692,314

Applicant(s)

KRANZ ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy N. Pardo

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 16, 2007 has been entered.

2. Applicant's Amendment filed on February 26, 2007 in response to Examiner's Office Final Action has been reviewed. Claims 1-45 are pending in the application. Claims 1-45 are amended. This Office Action is Non-Final.

1. Claims 1-45 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 19-32 are rejected under 35 USC § 101 because they are directed to non-statutory subject matter. For instance, claim 19 claims "a computer program product" recited in the preamble is not a concrete and tangible medium. In paragraph 0080 in specification defines that "the computer program product includes a computer usable medium. For example, such a

Art Unit: 2165

computer usable medium can include a readable memory device, such as a hard drive device, a CD-ROM, a DVD-ROM, or a computer diskette, having computer readable program code segments stored thereon. The computer readable medium can also include a communications or transmission medium, such as a bus or a communications link, optical, wired, or wireless, having program code segments carried thereon as digital or analog data signals". Claimed invention as a whole must be useful and accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result. See *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (*Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96 (1966)); *In re Fisher*, 421 F.3d 1365, 76 USPQ2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *In re Ziegler*, 992 F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2165

3. Claims 1, 6-17, 19, 24-35 and 39-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishii US Patent Application No. 2005/0021783.

As to claim 1, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:

maintaining licensing information [fig. 7; ab] on a sever system [license stored in a storage unit in license server 4 of fig. 1; S47 of fig. 8; fig. 11, 12];

using a URL address of a unit of digital content to identify the location of the licensing information [allowing the user to perform the license acquisition by clicking to URL link information on the license server, 0105; 0108], the licensing information comprising for allowing a source to provide the unit of digital content [the license server extracts the content to which the corresponding license can be applied and sends the client the content list including content information, such as the content ID, the URL for downloading the content, and the genre of each piece of the extracted content [0115]; and

examining the licensing information to confirm that the source identified by the URL address of the unit of digital content is licensed to provide the unit of digital content [the license server determines whether the result of the authorization from the accounting server permits the grant of the license, 0109; s42-s47 of fig. 8; s104-s105 of fig. 12; signatures of license and content are valid, S47 of fig. 8; 0093].

As to claim 19, all limitations of this claim have been addressed in the analysis above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

Art Unit: 2165

As to claims 33 and 45, they are apparatus claims of claims 1 and 33; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 6, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches locating licensing information on the server by determining at least one potential location for the licensing information on the server based on the address of the content [S41-S49 of fig. 8].

As to claim 7, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that the potential location determined for the licensing information is through a root directory on the server or through a subdirectory on the server where the content resides [0121].

As to claim 8, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches searching through the root directory for the licensing information [0055].

As to claim 9, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that if licensing information is not found through the root directory or if licensing information found through the root directory does not correspond to the content, further including searching through the subdirectory where the content resides on the server for the licensing information [0055; 0119-0123].

As to claim 10, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that obtaining licensing information is in response to a request, by a client system, to download the content from the server [S46-S47 of fig. 8].

As to claim 11, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches delivering the content to the client [S49 of fig. 8]; confirming that a URL pattern referenced in the licensing information corresponds to the URL address of the content [S47 of fig. 8]; and in response to confirming that the URL pattern corresponds to the URL addresses of the content, processing and rendering the content on the client [S49 of fig. 8].

As to claim 12, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that the licensing information includes a licensing key [license ID, fig. 7].

As to claim 13, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that the license key is an encrypted text file [0055-0060].

As to claim 14, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches overriding any other license key on the server when the license key is located through a root directory of the URL address of the content [0119-0123].

As to claim 15, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches determining whether the licensing information has been altered [S45 of fig. 8; 0093].

As to claim 16, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that the licensing information further includes information pertaining to restrictions on processing of the content [expiration date, attribute condition, usage rule, fig. 6-7-0091-0093].

As to claim 17, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that the licensing information further includes information about a feature of the content that is enabled or disabled [“decrypt content and output content” if signatures of license and content are valid and “error processing” if signatures of license and content are invalid, s47-s50 of fig. 8].

As to claim 34, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that the communications handler or the licensing manager is associated with a runtime environment executing on a client system [0092].

As to claim 35, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Ishii further teaches that a client system initiates the request to download the content from the server [fig. 3].

As to claims 24-32, 34, 35 and 39-44, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-5, 18, 20-23 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii US Patent Application No. 2005/0021783 in view of Gordon et al. (hereinafter "Gordon") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0181490.

As to claim 2, Ishii teaches the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of comparing the URL pattern referenced in the licensing information with the URL address of the content. Gordon teaches comparing the URL pattern referenced in the licensing information with the URL address of the content [the URL used by the subscriber as one that has been used in the past to request the file?, 0031]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Gordon to Ishii's system as an essential means to increase the speed of transmission licensed contents through securely distribute content system to consumers.

As to claim 3, Ishii and Gordon teach the invention substantially as claimed. Gordon further teaches confirming that the content is licensed by determining that the URL pattern referenced in the licensing information corresponds to the URL address of the content [0029].

As to claim 4, Ishii and Gordon teach the invention substantially as claimed. Gordon further teaches the URL pattern referenced in the licensing information corresponds to the URL address of the content when the URL pattern matches the URL address of the content [0029].

As to claim 5, Ishii and Gordon teach the invention substantially as claimed. Gordon further teaches responding to a URL pattern referenced in the licensing information that corresponds to the URL address of the content by directing a client system to process and render the content [0029-0031].

As to claim 18, Ishii and Gordon teach the invention substantially as claimed. Gordon further teaches that the URL pattern referenced in the licensing information indicates one or more URL addresses of licensed content [list of unique URLs, fig. 5].

As to claims 20-23, 36-38, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis of claims 1-5 and 18 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant argues that neither Ishii nor Gordon teaches or suggest a method of accessing licensed digital content and examining the licensing information to confirm that the content is licensed to be provided by a source identified by the URL address of the content.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner believes that these features are taught by Ishii and Gordon. Ishii teaches that when the user selects the license ID of the selected license to the content server via Internet. The content server can extract the content to which the corresponding license ID as the key. Subsequently, the license server provides the client the content ID and URL address for downloading the content [see 0115-0116]. Examiner also believes that the feature of verifying the digital license of content taught by Ishii does constitute the feature of examining the licensing information of the content in the Applicant's claimed invention.

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "examining the licensing information to confirming that content is licensed" as specified in claim 2 has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

6. Applicant's arguments filed on February 16, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur.

Art Unit: 2165

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 16, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

**THUY N. PARDO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**